

**REMARKS**

**SUMMARY**

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-38 were rejected in the above-identified final Office Action. Claims 14-19 and 33-38 are cancelled, without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1-13 and 20-32 remain pending in the application.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

1. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112," item 9 on page 8 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 14-38 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The rejections of claims 14-19 and 33-38 are obviated by their cancellations (without prejudice).

No specific reasons are provided for the rejection of claims 20-32 under §112, second paragraph. The only specific reason given is only mentioned in regard to claims 14-19 and 33-38, which are cancelled. Accordingly, without knowing any sort of specific reason, and upon Applicants' own further review of the claims, Applicants maintain that claims 20-32 are not indefinite under §112, second paragraph.

2. In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112," item 10 on page 8 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 14, 17, 19, 33, 36, and 38 have been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The rejections of claims 14, 17, 19, 33, 36, and 38 are obviated by their cancellations (without prejudice).

## **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102,” item 12 on page 8 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-7, 20-22, 25-26, 33, 36 and 38 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,292,936 to *Wang* (hereinafter “*Wang*”) under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e).

The rejections of claims 33, 36, and 38 are obviated by their cancellations (without prejudice).

Claim 1 calls for a “method of computing comprising:  
reading, by an execution engine, a data processing representation having code  
sections with code statements of at least a first and a second programming  
language;  
recognizing, by the execution engine, a first code section with at least code statements  
of a first programming language;  
invoking, by the execution engine, a first code statement processing unit of the first  
programming language to process the first code section;  
recognizing, by the execution engine, a second code section with at least code  
statements of a second programming language; and  
invoking, by the execution engine, a second code statement processing unit of the  
second programming language to process the second code section.”

In contrast, Wang fails to disclose, expressly or inherently, an execution engine that invokes **first and second** code statement processing units of first and second programming languages, as is claimed in amended claim 1. Wang merely teaches “an interpreter-based scripting environment [that] includes multiple runtime processors executed by the computer. Each of the runtime processors processes their respective corresponding intermediate sources derived from an original source in a synchronous manner” (abstract). The processors are interdependently invoked. Specifically, the original source disclosed in Wang comprises an HTML document with embedded Visual Basic scripting langauge blocks. Wang teaches a

single HTML parser that parses the original HTML + VB source, and translates the non-VB source into a first intermediate source executable by a Java VM, and the VB source into a second intermediate source having the VB script statements executable by a VB script interpreter.

Even if we were to read the Java VM and VB Script Interpreter as the recited first and second code statement processing units, Wang does not disclose an execution engine that invokes both of the Java VM and VB Script Interpreter. The HTML parser of Wang, described above, simply creates intermediate sources and does not invoke either of the Java VM or the VB Script Interpreter. According to Wang, col. 3, lines 57-67 and col. 4, lines 1-8, the Java VM is invoked first at runtime, and the VB Script Interpreter is later invoked by the Java VM. Thus, there is no common execution engine that invokes both the Java VM and the VB Script Interpreter and, therefore, Wang does not disclose the execution engine recited by claim 1.

Both Wang and the invention of claim 1 certainly teach methods of processing multi-language specifications. But Wang teaches an alternative solution to that proposed by the claimed invention of claim 1. In Wang, no common execution engine controls the “hand off” of execution between the code processing units. Thus, Wang inserts synchronizer tokens into the intermediate code to eliminate the need for a common execution engine. In contrast, the claimed invention of claim 1 does teach such a common “execution engine” that controls the invoking of both code processing units. Thus, in the claimed invention of claim 1, no synchronizer tokens are needed. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, Wang does not anticipate claim 1 and, because Wang proposes an alternative solution teaching away from that of claim 1, Wang does not even suggest claim 1.

Accordingly, amended claim 1 is patentable over Wang under §102(e).

Claim 20 is claim 1 in apparatus form, and thus recites similar limitations. Accordingly, claim 20 is also patentable over Wang for at least the above reasons.

Claims 2-3, 6-7, 22, and 25-26 and depend from claims 1 and 20, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 2-3, 6-7, 22, and 25-26 are patentable over Wang.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

1. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 14 on page 12 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 4, 5, 8, 23, 24 and 27 have been rejected as being obvious over Wang in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,732,330 to *Claussen* (hereinafter “Claussen”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claussen fails to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Wang. Therefore, claims 1 and 20 remain patentable over Wang even when combined with Claussen.

Claims 4, 5, 8, 23, 24, and 27 depend from claims 1 and 20, respectively, incorporating their limitations. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 4, 5, 8, 23, 24, and 27 are patentable over Wang and Claussen, alone or in combination.

2. In “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103,” item 15 on page 14 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 9-19, 28-32, 34, 35, and 37 have been rejected as being obvious over Wang in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,428,792 to *Conner et al.* (hereinafter “Conner”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The rejections of claims 14-19, 34-35, and 37 are obviated by their cancellations.

Conner fails to cure the above discussed deficiencies of Wang. Therefore, claims 1 and 20 remain patentable over Wang even when combined with Conner.

Claims 9-13 and 28-32 depend from claims 1 and 20, incorporating their limitations respectively. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 9-13 and 28-32 are patentable over Wang and Conner, alone or in combination.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-13 and 20-32 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1513. If any fees are due in connection with this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account 500393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: April 25, 2007 by: /Robert C. Peck/  
Robert C. Peck  
Reg. No.: 56,826

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.  
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900  
1211 SW Fifth Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97222  
Telephone: 503-222-9981